DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 137 SP 002 382

By-Kenney, Helen J.

The Subject of Issues: Defining Central Problems and Questions in Preparing Teachers of Disadvantaged Youth. Report Four. NDEA National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; Ball State Univ., Muncie, Ind.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Nov 68
Note-15p.
Available from-The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($1.00).
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.85
Descriptors-*Disadvantaged Youth, *Teacher Education

This document accounts a 1966 NDEA National Institute task force meeting which attempted to define, through group discussion, questions and problems related to preparing teachers for the disadvantaged. A two-page "relevant issues" paper (outlining such questions as "Should an intra-university program for training teachers of the disadvantaged be developed?") is presented as the framework for the discussion that appears in transcript along with author comments in the remainder of the document. Discussion centered on defining the disadvantaged child and his teacher, relevant theories of learning and teaching, relevant curriculum, educational design, and change. (LP)

ED028137

THE NDEA NATIONAL INSTITUTE
for advanced study in teaching disadvantaged youth

REPORT/FOUR
NOVEMBER, 1968

1201 SIXTEENTH STREET, NW, WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE SUBJECT OF ISSUES: DEFINING CENTRAL PROBLEMS AND QUESTIONS IN PREPARING TEACHERS OF DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

Prepared by
Helen J. Kenney
Associate Professor of Education
Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts

A Project supported by the Office of Education administered by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in conjunction with Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.

SP002382

Introduction: The Business of Definition

Samuel Johnson, in a contribution to *The Rambler*, commented that one of the maxims of the civil law is that definitions are hazardous.* To those members of the task force of the NDEA National Institute attending the meeting in late November, 1966, Johnson's observation was highly relevant to the matter under discussion.

Since the earliest meetings of this group, however, it had been clear that despite the dangers involved in premature simplification of the structure, work, and plans of the Institute, some effort had to be made to design a tentative format for the group's discourses. To that end a working outline was prepared which listed some issues relevant to the preparation of teachers of the disadvantaged. No particular defense was made of the validity or comprehensiveness of the issues as presented; they represented merely one way of looking at the material problems of preparing teachers of the disadvantaged. It was hoped that a substantial discussion of them would yield a further deepening and delineation of such crucial issues.

This present account of a day's discussion of broad-ranging problems and questions touching on vital areas of the school, home, and the community by an informed and articulate group of scholars and specialists is necessarily selective. In an effort, however, to preserve something of the dynamics of the dialog that took place that day at San Francisco, the original "relevant issues" paper (pages 2 and 3 of this publication) is followed by excerpts from the discussion that appear to clarify and round out the main elements of the original document.

* *The Rambler*, May 28, 1751.

SOME ISSUES RELEVANT TO THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF THE DISADVANTAGED

A. *DEFINITION OF THE DISADVANTAGED PUPIL*

1. Does the term *disadvantaged* refer to children who are different because of the lack of American middle-class cultural virtues and values?
2. Should the disadvantaged be identified in terms of economic and social disadvantages or in terms of patterns of learning facility and learning difficulty?
3. What are the social, cultural, and learning assets of the disadvantaged? How can these assets of the poor — as well as their disadvantages — be made a focus of the training of teachers?
4. Should the identification and definition of these disadvantages and assets be left to the poor themselves? How do they see their social and educational needs, ambitions, and goals?

B. *DEVELOPMENT OF RELEVANT THEORIES OF LEARNING*

1. What are relevant learning theories for the disadvantaged? How do they differ from learning theories for the advantaged? Are present learning theories relevant for the advantaged, or do the advantaged learn because of strong motivation from cultural expectations?
2. How can relevant learning theories be developed in teacher training programs and implemented in the schools?

C. *DEVELOPMENT OF A RELEVANT CURRICULUM*

1. Should compensatory programs attempt to compensate for the inadequacies of the students or for the inadequacies of the curriculum?
2. Should the fundamental problem of the inadequate education of the disadvantaged be viewed as a result of a failure to provide relevant curricula within the school structure or as a reflection of the inadequacy of the basic school structure?
3. In structure and in content, how does a meaningful curriculum for the disadvantaged differ from a meaningful curriculum for the advantaged?
4. What are the most important criteria for relevancy in a curriculum for the disadvantaged?
5. What are the levers of change in curricula: administrators' and teachers' attitudes? teachers' skills? basic school structure?

D. *PROFILE OF THE TEACHER OF THE DISADVANTAGED*

1. How can the teacher's formal work structure be defined especially in relation to the social worker, the therapist, an identification figure, a representation of the "establishment"?
2. Should the role of teacher be redefined to include subprofessionals and liaisons between the school and community, especially as these include representatives from the future job world of the disadvantaged?
3. Should prospective teachers personally be motivated to function effectively in existing school systems, or to function as change agents who are non-accommodating to the present system?
4. What are the assets and disadvantages of a middle-class teacher's teaching the disadvantaged; of a lower-class teacher's teaching the disadvantaged?
5. Is there a certain type of person who can teach the disadvantaged? Does an effective teacher of the disadvantaged have identifiable personal qualities?

TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS

A. *LOCATION OF PROGRAMS*

1. Assuming limited resources, should training programs be concentrated in areas where quality training resources prevail, or should they be spread to achieve a maximum quantitative effect; e.g., in areas where the rural disadvantaged are found; and where most prospective teachers of the disadvantaged are trained — state colleges.
2. How should inter-university research be administered and supported so as to make teacher training of the disadvantaged a joint effort?

B. *STRUCTURE AND FLEXIBILITY OF PROGRAMS*

1. For how many years should the training of teachers extend? Should training vary depending upon the professional goals of the prospective teachers?
2. Should training programs be restructured to open channels for subprofessionals to earn teaching accreditation?
3. What should the sequence of experiences (particularly laboratory experiences) for the prospective teacher be?

C. *THE PROCESS OF CHANGING ATTITUDES AND DEVELOPING UNDERSTANDING OF THE DISADVANTAGED*

1. How can changes in attitude and development of understandings of the disadvantaged be effected? Can these be accomplished through involvement in communities of the disadvantaged or extended practice teaching?

2. How important is the development of professional self-insight in attitude change and in development of understandings? What should the training program provide by way of group discussion, personal supervision, and group spirit to foster the growth of individual self-insight?

D. LABORATORY EXPERIENCE

1. Should the preparation of teachers of the disadvantaged involve work in community agencies outside the schools?
2. How can the student teaching experience be restructured so to provide the prospective teacher with more teaching experience and more quality supervision?

E. THE PROCESS OF TEACHING: HOW CAN IT BE TAUGHT?

1. To what extent is successful teaching of the disadvantaged a function of the teacher's personal qualities? To what extent can teaching styles and skills be taught by one person to another?
2. How can prospective teachers learn the process of discipline in classes of the disadvantaged?
3. How can the prospective teacher learn to tap the motivations of disadvantaged youth? Are there conflicts between the motivations of the prospective teacher from the middle-class and the motivations of disadvantaged youth? If so, how can teachers learn to resolve these conflicts?

F. THE PROSPECTIVE TEACHER AND CURRICULUM FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

1. How can teachers be trained to design curricula as well as to implement them?
2. How can book-oriented prospective teachers be trained to design and implement curricula for disadvantaged youth that is physically active and job-world oriented?

G. JOINT RESPONSIBILITY OF COLLEGES OF EDUCATION WITH ACADEMICIANS, SCHOOL SYSTEMS, AND COMMUNITIES FOR THE PREPARATION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION OF TEACHERS

1. Joint Responsibility of Colleges of Education with Academicians:
   a. Should an intra-university program for training teachers of the disadvantaged be developed?
   b. How can the academicians contribute to the development of relevant curricula for the disadvantaged?
2. Joint Responsibility of Colleges of Education with School Systems:
   a. Should the colleges of education have joint responsibility with the school systems for the development of curricula; e.g., through research?
   b. Should professors of education and academic specialists have the actual experience of teaching in classes of the disadvantaged?
   c. Should teachers with supervisory skill be released part time to supervise student teachers?
   d. Should teachers and other school personnel with college training skill be released part time to teach in the colleges of education?
   e. How can colleges of education involve the decision-makers of the school systems in their planning and activities?
3. Joint Responsibility of Colleges of Education with the Community:
   a. Should teacher training programs for the disadvantaged be structured to use resources of families in the community of the disadvantaged in the planning, implementation, and goal setting of the education of their children?
   b. Should teacher training programs take advantage of the resources of community leaders and agencies already working with the disadvantaged? How can joint action between these people and the colleges of education be initiated?
   c. How can teachers be trained for the role of change agent in the community?

H. THE ROLE OF RESEARCH

1. How can the process of training teachers to teach the disadvantaged become diagnostic and research oriented?
2. How can prospective teachers be trained to become diagnosticians and researchers?
3. Can the process of research help to provide the purposefulness and inter-group involvement necessary in the training of teachers for disadvantaged youth?

I. IMAGE AND GROUP IDENTITY

1. How can teacher training programs for prospective teachers of the disadvantaged develop a sense of identity, purpose, and positive recognition among professional educators and prospective teachers?
2. How can programs for training teachers of the disadvantaged help to reduce the stigma created by the label *disadvantaged*?

THE DISCUSSION OF THE RELEVANT ISSUES

THE CHILD AND HIS EDUCATION

The discussion began systematically; that is, *Defining the Disadvantaged Pupil* (point A) was taken up first. It was not long, however, before it became clear that consideration of a more fundamental issue was necessary. The question was raised: What is the major basis of the problem? and several answers were offered. In order to capture the flavor as well as the substance of the discussion these remarks will be as close to a verbatim report as is possible from taped group talk. Also, speakers will be identified where possible.

Pearl: I think it's a *structural problem* rising from the way we organize education rather than a problem of the attributes of the kid. I think the schools they go to offer them very different kinds of opportunity. What's the nature of that school process that these kids go to? That is to me the essence of where denial takes place.

I think the biggest denial that they face is *the expectation of their performance.* Very quickly they walk into a system and they're expected to do poorly. Expectation becomes the feeling, and on the basis of tests in the first grade they are already being told in disproportionate numbers that they are "bluebirds" rather than "canaries" which means that the expectations of their performances is a very powerful limiting factor.

Secondly, I think the whole authoritarian repressiveness of their school is a very different kind of a school than our kids go to. There is no climate for learning.

There is little tolerance for deviance. They cannot be as different as our kids can be different. My kid comes with hair over his ears and he doesn't ever get sent home and told to get a haircut. All my kids are pretty deviant as far as the school is concerned, yet they never get in difficulty. The poor kids have been in all kinds of trouble. Look at their opportunity for expression. They are rendered more passive because they have much less power to do anything within the system.

The curriculum is duller. It's more tedious, more drab. It has much less relevance to any part of their lives. There is no reason in the world for them to go to school.

They are denied any meaningful gratification as students — a sense of competence, a feeling of belonging, and the opportunity to make a contribution.

Those to me are the structural aspects of a school that lead to the denial of these kinds of opportunities — opportunities to be respected citizens; opportunities to be cultural carriers; opportunities for career choice; and opportunities to be interpersonally and intrapersonally competent.

But if you start with the premise that the nature of the problem has to do with the structure of the school, then you move next to the nature of the people in the school called teachers; then you move to the nature of the experiences; then you move to relevant theory, and then finally you say, "Who are the kids who get caught up the most in the situation?"

Maybe this is really number one: "What's the nature of the public schools that is systematically denying many kids access?"

Given the nature of the organization of that world out there, then what we've really got to give them in a nonjudgmental way are the tools to be able to exercise their choice. We systematically don't teach them to read. We systematically don't give them computational skills. We systematically blunt their aspirations and their expectations. We systematically deny them opportunities to get the gratifications from enjoyment of culture and art and history. And we systematically brutalize them as individuals. It's this system that I think we've got to attend to.

I say we have one value across all social strata: "Don't blow your cool." "Don't rock the boat. Don't make waves. Don't get in trouble. Conform."

This point was then extended.

> *Rivlin:* Art is saying that the most important thing in learning is the creation of conditions to make learning possible, and he gave a very good analysis of what I think is involved in that. Some learning is taking place, but what you ask now is "Who are the youngsters who need a new theory of learning more than other youngsters do?" I think you still come back to the need for the defining and distinguishing of the youngsters who present the problem today.

The underlying duality of these two positions was pinpointed in these remarks.

> *Haubrich:* What I'm concerned about is that our defining the problem also defines the solution. If we define the problem in terms of attributes of disadvantaged kids, then it's not at all surprising that we talk of compensatory programs. But if we define the problem in terms of inadequate schools, then I think we have a very different kind of strategy. That is the biggest objection I've had to the poverty program in the elementary and secondary school act programs — defining the problem as something wrong with the schools. Now we can ask, "Why do these kids have problems?" You've answered this, in effect, when you say it depends on their income level and their resident level, for that puts the primary problem on a structural rather than a personality problem.

This opening phase closed on a series of comments that set forth the need for clear statements of the school's role in the world. School can no longer be viewed as merely interaction of "kids, curriculum, and teacher." There are fundamental economic and cultural aspects of the educational process which must be given their due weight. The general argument was summarized in this way:

> *Kvaraceus:* There cannot be a "yes" or "no" about one goal versus another; all are really important. But we posture something unrealistic in schools if we think the schools can do it all. This brings in the issue of "You can't do it without the schools but can the schools go it alone?" I would say that we have to look to and get the help of the poverty program as well as look to the improvement of the schools.

The discussion then moved back to the working outline after agreement that each area would be covered in turn insofar as time allowed. Not surprisingly, the earlier points received more attention than did those coming later. It was nonetheless possible to get some reaction to all of them. The underlying rationale of priority among the issues went something like this:

> What are the *goals* of the school?
>
> What is the *structure* of the school that should be generated to meet these goals?
>
> Who are the relevant *actors, roles* for the structure and the goals?
>
> What kind of *training* does a person need to go through to perform these roles?
>
> What *theory* needs to be drawn upon to generate this kind of training skill and competence?
>
> Where are the *modifications* and *variations* for different types of persons to fill these roles?

NOTE: While it has been necessary to abstract the discussion, an effort has been made to represent the widest range of opinions on each topic.

IT'S NOT WHAT THE CHILD IS LABELED AS MUCH AS WHAT LABEL HE'S BUYING.

Kvaraceus: My initial reaction to this is that in general we have, implicitly, a monolithic notion of the disadvantaged child. I would say that *A* should read *Defining and Differentiating the Disadvantaged* because we have so many kinds of disadvantaged youngsters and we ought to carry that notion throughout. In (1) the key word here is "lack." I want to play with another word, saying instead "reactions" so that we are talking about children who are different because of reactions to American middle-class cultural virtues and values. The basic notion is that it isn't the label as I think some of these research studies are saying but rather it is what label you're buying. If you are a kid in a Job Corps Center, at least you have volunteered to move. I see many of these kids as the top of the bottom — those who have the most promise — as against the bottom of the bottom — those who wouldn't apply; couldn't apply; don't know how to. The general idea is that we ought to talk about the youngster on his way rather than the fact that he, at present, happens to be a kid who represents the lower socio-economic level or is a lower class kid. But if he's presently mobile — on the way — no matter how lousy your schools are, this kid's going to make it as many of them have in the past. On the other hand, he may be a kid who is motivated but not quite making it. One little obstacle throws him out and then he thumbs his nose at the school and he quits. What I'm trying to get at is the fact that I'm not so sure that the crucial issue is one of what the kid is lacking the most. It's what he is *seeking* or *not seeking* and what obstacles he has in his way.

IS IT A QUESTION OF DIFFERING FROM MAJORITY VALUES?

Cohen: When we refer to the *disadvantaged* we may not only be referring to those who are different because of the lack of American middle-class cultural virtues and values. We may also be referring to the many people coming from middle-class or upper-class families who are also different because they are revolting against middle-class cultural virtues and values.

I wonder if we really are not talking about the question of the term *disadvantaged* as applied to children who are different because they do not identify with the majority. If we are concerned with maintaining or developing values that are not held to be vital by the majority, then we have some basis for action. Minority groups have established and are maintaining their own systems. Possibly the issue is whether or not to help the denied develop an independent system which will allow them to maintain the values that the majority reject. The problem is to somehow allow the students to express themselves in a way that our present school system makes impossible.

BUT WE STILL HAVE TO IDENTIFY THE YOUNGSTER.

Rivlin: But you still have to identify the youngsters. If you take income, residence, and parent education, the poorest groups in New York, in terms of income, are the children of graduate students at Columbia and N.Y.U. In terms of where they live, they're living in practically the same area as slum kids. Look around N.Y.U. and Columbia. But the difference is that these parents are on their way to getting their doctorates, and while their children may not have money this year, they're going somewhere.

WE SHOULD NOT FORGET THE POSITIVE

Taylor: The *quality of community life is quite often of a higher value within the poor income groups* than it is in what we're accustomed to calling middle income or upper middle income, in that *there are certain values like personal loyalties and family loyalties.* I think *on the positive side you have a thrust from family life which hasn't really been given enough chance.*

Putting it positively, if the school is to be effective in the life of the child, it must move through the community context and involve itself in the parents; moreover, they need to become adjacent and extensive teachers within the total context of what we're thinking of as education.

WE MIGHT SAY THAT THE PROBLEM OF DEFINING AND DIFFERENTIATING SHOULD BE RELATIVE TO A CONTEXT.

Kvaraceus: I think our typical notion of the definition is useful and helpful. We play different roles nowadays. We should talk about what child we are really concerned about. We could use the credit card definition — whether or not the child is being denied access to mainstream society. But if we're talking politically in terms of legislation, we can't use that kind of definition; we have to use something like the Title I definition, which is good for political purposes. For research purposes we have to use something operational again. It seems that as long as it's clear as to what role we're playing and what hat we're wearing at any given moment, we can move from definition to definition without at the same time saying that all economically poor kids are disadvantaged or vice versa.

RELEVANT THEORIES OF LEARNING AND TEACHING

THERE IS NO RELEVANT THEORY OF LEARNING FOR THE CLASSROOM.

Kenney: There has been very little work in the field which directly relates to the kind of learning presumably taking place in the classroom, particularly in the discursive subject matter areas, such as social studies. There is very little systematic work on basic cognitive processes. There are some studies, surely, but the field is not yielding the data that we need to develop a relevant theory of learning for the kids in the classroom. Whether or not the experimental psychologist can do this for us is still a question. I'm not intending to denigrate the work of the experimental psychologists, for they certainly supply us with models for rigorous investigation. I'd like to apply their models. But if we do want a relevant theory, it has to be developed, and not selected from existing knowledge.

THERE IS NEED FOR A SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY.

I think that the basic fallacies in the theories of learning is that they dealt with cognitive psychology of individual children, and it makes a world of difference whether you're working with one youngster in isolation or whether you're working with them in a social system.

I think there should be a team working to develop a theory of learning. You need not only the psychologist — the person who knows something about the cognitive functioning of the kid — but you also need an anthropologist. We don't have an anthropology of the classroom.

We should differentiate between a theory of learning and a theory of instruction. At the Yale Conference, [See *Report One: The Yale Conference,* AACTE, 1967.] we said that unless the school has some kind of theory of instruction then the present theory of learning is going to act as an absolute and that will get us in trouble.

WE CAN HAVE THE STUDENTS BUILD RELEVANT THEORIES OF LEARNING AND TEACHING.

Taylor: I've pushed myself through a good many of the texts used in the schools of education as a kind of discipline so that I know what I'm talking about. I think most of it is completely irrelevant to anything that the teacher could ever use. It is also irrelevant to one's understanding of how the human nature develops as human, or even as nature. I would argue for a theory of instruction in which the empirical study in a one to one relationship, case studies, group studies, is done by freshmen who are becoming teachers. This would replenish the store of empirical data which otherwise the kid will never get from many of the texts. They can study each other if they want to, or take one child in the freshman year and be responsible for reporting on him to a seminar which could be run by the students themselves.

At the center of my own thinking of how we need to reconstitute the teacher preparation is the idea that you can teach by having high school students teach elementary school kids, by having college kids teach each other and by their tutoring in the high schools and the elementary schools.

By having graduate students directly related to undergraduates as partners and tutors, we now shake up the whole thing. Then, the flood of data about the people who are directly acquainted with their own learning does give us the resources for building a new kind of learning theory by those who are doing the teaching. In other words, I think that unless we direct their attention to the kind of informal and formal research which they should be doing to make more precise their own observations about their own children, we aren't going to reach them anyway with any text. With Jerome Bruner or anyone, because Jerry Bruner is not interesting to a freshman until he has begun teaching.

I think there are various stages of sophistication within the research of which a student is capable. I'm not thinking of the student as becoming a teacher. The freshman, by identifying the character of his raw experience with a child, can reach a certain level of sophistication by being asked to make a research report in descriptive terms of one child in a nursery school or however. At the next level he refines his data — to use that fancy word — in a seminar with other students where they are comparing each other's cases. I watched a two hour class in a terribly interesting institution that happens to be located in this city, in which each of the students in a class of about thirty-five had been working on the problem of dropouts for a period of three weeks. Each of them had been observing in the school and had handled, had managed to establish contact with the kids who had dropped out. Each student was responsible to the whole class for coming in three weeks later with substantially a case study under his belt. Well, I was astonished at the quality of insight which those students had as soon as the discussion began. The method of teaching the thing was to have one of the students who had taken a tape of his dropout play it before the class. It played for about twenty minutes and then there was a panel of a couple of others who had been asked to comment on that case. Well, by the time the two hours were over — it could have gone on all day and I imagine it went on a couple of weeks after I was there — the quality of insight which developed through the comparative case study approach meant that those kids could then go back and write up their cases with the benefit of having heard other people talk and the teacher comment. I think we have to think of research for the preparation of teachers somewhat in those terms and without the formality we usually associate with the high-class word.

ULTIMATELY THERE IS NEED FOR A THEORETICAL DESIGN.

I have a hunch that unless there is some kind of instructional hypothesis, people can go through all kinds of experiences that look very interesting and provocative. If they don't get in some kind of design in terms of instruction, however, then other people can do the same things and end up in irrelevant kinds of behavior.

MAKING THE CURRICULUM RELEVANT

The question of a relevant curriculum pivoted around three main themes: relevancy as it concerns the students themselves in terms of their personal aspirations and feelings; relevancy as it relates to the broader aspects of the individual in society; and relevancy as it pertains to the bureaucratic structure of the school system.

As before, the members speak for themselves:

WE MUST CONSIDER THE STUDENT FIRST IF WE ARE TO MAKE SCHOOL RELEVANT.

Kvaraceus: As I look at education and the special compensatory provisions, they all really denigrate the Negro.

There is a particular danger in our cutting off the ceiling. One of the things I see in Art Pearl's ideas is that he's always got a nice career line built in. The best thing I could say about the Rodman Job Corps Center is that you can become a white collar worker and be a programmer, believe it or not, on an IBM machine even though you never finished grammar school. That's about the one Job Corps Center where I believe they had considerable reach. It really dignified the kids.

Taylor: I found in a seventh grade class in Scarsdale, which I taught a couple of days when I came back from Asia, that it took me about the first fifteen or twenty minutes to get any sense from this group of well-to-do kids from families who are in touch with world affairs, or at least know where Asia is. I found that their disadvantage was a complete lack of awareness of many of the things different groups of children of the same age had learned.

Disadvantaged groups I've taught had the advantage in that they didn't pretend to know anything: therefore they asked me damn good questions. The advantaged have the negative support of families who resist the impact of the rest of the world on them.

I think a meaningful curriculum for the disadvantaged differs from the meaningful curriculum for the advantaged in that we have to say, "What are we trying to do with the curriculum?" If we try to enlarge the sensitivity of the child to a world beyond what he would ordinarily be in if we weren't there to help him, then it's the same problem in both curricula.

RELEVANCY IS A MATTER OF GOALS.

Pearl: Let's go back to what I think is relevant — back to the goals. How relevant is education to the goals? What are the goals?

One of the goals is to open up the system for career choice so that you have a wide spectrum. You not only have to be talking about making this real to him, but you've got to make the structure of education such that if he makes a commitment, there are steps for him to reach that goal. You can't ask a person to commit himself to go into college if college is not really there for him to go to. Taking the values of culture-carrying and the exhilaration of learning itself, we had better take a look at some of the dumping things that we do, such as *art depreciation courses.* We cool-out the deviant kid by dumping him into an art class. That way he never really has the opportunity to get the gratifications from understanding history and other kinds of cultural values.

On the question of the value of being a citizen in a democratic society, how does he get involved in the meaningful power of political decisions in the school so that it becomes *his* school, including such things as being on advisory committees to curriculum or having some chance to advise on promotion and tenure?

And what about opportunities to use all of these kinds of experiences to become interpersonally and intrapersonally competent so that the structure of the class begins to stimulate the kinds of functions that one is preparing for. It could start right in the first grade. But now, can't you begin to see how grouping processes begin to violate this meaning of education? how the perverted paternalism or maternalism of patting a kid on the head and telling him, "You're doing as well as a dumb kid like you can do" will do the kid in?

WE MUST CHANGE THE BUREAUCRATIC SYSTEM OF REWARDS AND PUNISHMENT.

Haubrich: If you look at the system of curriculum and its enforcement, then you have to look at the bureaucratic model in the school and a bureaucratic model in the school is essentially one of punishment. If you don't make it, you're going to be failed. The Indian child, for example, can be put down the tube twice in the first three grades and there's nothing left after that for the youngster.

I'm suggesting that you can talk all you want to about relevancy, but you've got to go to the consequences of that relevancy or irrelevancy — failure or college entrance — all of which is a threat to the kid.

PROFILING THE TEACHER OF THE DISADVANTAGED

Conceding that the notion of profiling an effective teacher of either the advantaged or disadvantaged was obviously unrealistic and probably erroneous in concept, the group tackled a number of identifiable attributes which looked as though they might have something to do with successful teaching.

THERE ARE LEVELS OF TEACHING PERSONNEL; EACH WILL HAVE ITS SET OF CRITERIA OF EFFECTIVENESS

Pearl: I feel that the most qualified person in the teacher world is primarily a *teacher of teachers.* He cannot be the detached member of a faculty. He's also going to be a consultant — if he's going to be a professional — to those persons who are dealing with problems on a day-to-day basis. He's going to be a specialist who is able to deal with the higher kinds of hang-ups of understanding and application of theory to practice. He's going to be a program developer. He's going to have the administrative and supervisory skills necessary to move around in complicated organizational structures.

What we're talking about here is the *teaching associate,* who will be a senior member of a teaching team. He has to be able to establish a contact based on different attributes. First, he has to have an enormous amount of integrity which I think is a trainable kind of an attribute; that is, he's got to be a person to whom the students can look to as a source of support. One of the things that I find amazing in urban schools is that none of the kids look upon the teacher as a "soul brother." There's nobody in the kind of world in which we live who's better prepared than the teacher, to be a real "soul brother." He can really help a guy make it in this world. And yet, the nature of the contract involves a sensitivity to oneself and to the other person. This is something that takes enormous amounts of training and development of skill and experience.

Secondly, he has to have strength. Now strength, as far as I'm concerned, is experience and knowledge that the teacher is willing to share. That's the basis of strength in the school situation. He not only is knowledgeable in a content area but he knows how to share his knowledge. This requires

an enormous amount of training and experience, training in the knowledge components so that he doesn't go up there and blabber about things he just vaguely knows. But he also has to achieve the skill in being able to communicate such knowledge and get it across and point out how it's relevant and make it clear so that the kids aren't getting lost. Third, he has to be hip. What I mean by hip is that he has to understand the hang-ups that the kid is caught with. He has to have enormous amounts of understanding of sociology, psychology, anthropology, the political scene, so that he understands what this kid is confronting and why he doesn't get past this or that kind of thing.

SOME TEACHERS APPEAR TO BE MAKING IT WITH DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN.

Taylor: One of these girls went into a senior high school a few years ago to teach. She became, at her volition, one of the leaders of the cheering squad, or some such thing as this. The girls in school said "Why, this Jeannie is real limber and knows how to do things, just like teen-agers do." She was a girl of aout twenty-four, which makes her kind of ancient to a fifteen-year-old. She's still there, doesn't want to leave, has no intention of leaving. She's mainly a teacher of English, and I'm not sure what it is but these lower-class kids, lower-class Negro kids as a matter of fact, like her English classes. I've not looked carefully enough to see what it is she's doing that makes them like her, but they do. I think maybe she treats them like people.

I think she demonstrates in some way that she has some respect for them as individuals. I can't identify this actually, I haven't watched closely enough. But the fact is that the principal in the office gets fewer complaints from her about the way the kids behave and the fact is that they get fewer complaints about the kids cutting her classes than they get from other people.

I think there is an expectation in terms of the way she operates. Let me give you a real example. Physically the classrooms look like places where learning is expected to take place.

I find it hard to talk in a typology for those who can teach the disadvantaged, except to go back to certain kinds of primitive human characteristics which we should be engaged in developing in all the teachers anywhere.

WHO SHOULD BE TEACHING?

Not everybody who is teaching should be teaching. One of the reasons that a lot of people are teaching who shouldn't be teaching is that we're drawing from too narrow a universe. So long as we draw from such a universe, we'll always have people in the classrooms who shouldn't be there. I argue not to talk so much about the different kinds of attributes that middle-class persons have, but to draw from a broader universe so that we can have more talent. That's one point.

Another point is that part of an educational process should be the opportunities for exposure and association with a wide universe of persons. One of the things that disturbs me about education is that it is restrictive in the kinds of experiences that teachers have. The more segregated it is, the more restrictive it is. You can talk about integration by looking at the attributes of the students and you can talk about integration by looking at the attributes of the people who are teaching them. If you want to develop interpersonally competent people through education, one way is to broaden the universe from which we draw teachers, and another is to broaden the experimental range for the students who are exposed to teachers.

If we are thinking of the concrete implications of this I would extend it by having teachers from the lower class teaching both the disadvantaged and the advantaged.

TEACHER EDUCATION: SOME ELEMENTS OF NEW DESIGN

The substance of the discussion on the means of teacher education may be summed up in this general statement. *Institutions of higher learning preparing teachers of all children in contemporary America should organize their programs on the basic principle of maximum effect.* This implies imaginative mobilization of university resources through the consortium model, genuine linking of the campus with the community at home and abroad, and a sincere commitment to intelligent innovation and experimentation. To flesh out these major ideas, the excerpts that follow will illuminate only a few of the important issues implied in them. Time for the meeting was running out so that it was possible to touch on points only briefly.

Shipman: The training programs might be located in two kinds of institutions: a cluster of institutions located outside of the south in which quality resources are available; and a cluster of developing institutions — predominantly Negro institutions which have potential for developing quality resources in terms of faculty and facilities — with a strong history of having a climate conducive to experimentation.

We already have a little consortium of five developing institutions working with a strong institution in North Carolina. We have ample number of places in the public schools to place students. We are working with Duke University at the moment on a team-teaching situation with student teachers. A Negro student teacher and a white student teacher will go into a school situation and work together. We are getting requests for this kind of pattern from many of the superintendents who find that it is pretty difficult to meet the federal guidelines and court orders which require that a certain percentage of the faculty be integrated.

I think it is worthy of experimentation. Who knows whether a cluster of institutions with highly trained faculties who are working with teacher training would be more effective than a group of developing institutions with a strong institution working with teacher trainees?

WE MUST LINK TEACHER TRAINING TO THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM; WE SHOULD REACH OUT TO THE WIDER WORLD OF COMMUNITY AND SOCIETY.

One of the things that we said earlier was that no teacher training could be relevant unless it was somehow linked with the public school system. Do we have enough real settings — assuming that we have the kind of linkage with the university we want — for college students in which this kind of meaningful experience could go on in the public school? Are the schools apt to reinforce the things that we are aiming at or are the public schools apt to reinforce the *status quo*?

Taylor: One of the worries that you have about the consortium of developing institutions might be removed to some extent if we thought of sending to some of these regional arrangements in the north and the south groups of matched teams of students for a year of field work. This would be like a junior year abroad, and would be linked to work in the social sciences back in their home institutions. The student would have a combination of duties, including research on the problems in the north or south — political, social, cultural, economic — which would be fed into the work which they do at the host university. Also, I think that the consideration of the Negro colleges in the south as places where developmental problems common to all educational systems everywhere in the world are exemplified argues for an exchange like the Peace Corps by which we could bring in Asians and Africans, Europeans, and Westerners, Latin Americans. Go at it in an international sense.

I think too that we have been too restrictive in our own conception of youngsters travelling around the country. Why not place (and it doesn't cost that much) San Francisco State teacher education students in another

state and in another city, using a modified Antioch plan? One of the most extraordinary things that can happen to a 19-year-old San Francisco boy is to spend a year in Chicago or vice-versa. We should think of the entire country as being an exciting experimental situation into which extraordinary things can happen — if the combination of the right things take place.

OTHER PROFESSIONS HAVE PROMISING APPROACHES TOWARD MEETING GREAT DEMANDS OF PERSONNEL WITH LIMITED RESOURCES.

Trippe: We can all learn a lot from the social work model. They taught psychiatrists how to train psychiatrists. You talk to people in social work education and they say that probably no more than five to ten per cent of the professional positions in social work in the United States are held by professionally trained social workers. And you can translate that to what is happening in education. We need trained teachers and so we have this game between the state education department and the schools of education where we always manage to train the number of teachers that are necessary in relation to the need or at least relatively close to it.

I'd like to see us focus on the role of the building principal and what we can do in terms of fostering training programs for educational leaders. Maybe we don't have enough time and we don't have enough resources to be concerned about training teachers and so we leave this to the business of the educational establishment. Once it's set in the proper direction, much as business itself, schools can train their own people. But given a choice, maybe we'd be better off focusing on principals. I know that a lot of teachers blame the principals for not being able to do what they want to do. I think generally, however, it's part of the problem to which we haven't given sufficient attention.

Kvaraceus: We need to think about expanding our definition of teacher education. It's fairly reasonable for us to always think in terms of the classroom teacher. But I think we have some responsibility for thinking about the non-school kinds of things that have just got to get into this picture if we're going to make our education relevant. There are a lot of non-school kinds of things that require the preparation of trainers, of educational personnel.

THE CHALLENGE OF CHANGE

THERE IS THE QUESTION OF THE PENDULUM SWING WITHOUT RESEARCH CONTROL.

What concerns me about the pendulum swing is that we're swinging back and forth without any kind of meaningful evaluation of anything that happened at each swing of the pendulum. What are the things we want to see happen? I think we wouldn't have too difficult a way of arriving at some consensus on outcome criteria — the kind of things we'd like to see a person learn, how he can handle transfer, generalization, and things of this nature. Then I think we'd have to start making an effort to clarify some of the intervention strategies. How does a laboratory experience fit into a general implementation strategy? What are the kinds of things we want to see being done in a laboratory? Some things can better be done in a lab than can be done in a school setting because you have more control over the intervention. You can set up somewhat ideal circumstances dealing with some basic notions of learning capacities, ways things should be packaged, and the like. We're also going to have to deal with quality control. It's the lack of this research control that produced the sort of swinging pendulum without giving us a solid basis of knowledge. Because of this we share our ignorance because we fail to profit from all the

things that have gone on before. That way we lament the lack of change and the lack of thrust in education and the inability to make innovation stick. I'd like to see these things not *yes, no, either, or,* but how they all fit into an implementation strategy. Let's define different models, different theories, different approaches so they can be systematically tested.

WHO ARE THE AGENTS OF CHANGE?

Foster: Let me try to take it as I understand it from my experiences. It seems to me that in general *we start with school boards who are at the highest level of irrelevancy.* They've come through the system of irrelevance; they seem to feel that something has happened by their being irrelevant; they've gotten into this job. They then begin to look for a superintendent who can carry out their irrelevancy.

Don't rock the boat; don't make waves — the system has organized this particular way and has communicated it in a lot of ways to teachers. The teacher who does something to begin to rock the boat is going to find them saying, "This isn't the way the game is played here." For instance if you bring in Head Start, it'll almost get pushed over to some side to be sure that it doesn't rock the internal system.

I'm not being negative because I think there are changes coming, and I want to try to say where they come from. Every once in a while a school board makes a mistake. They hire some guy that they didn't expect to behave this way, and he's got four years or three years, and he doesn't give a damn, and he begins to say to a staff, "Hey, let's not give a damn for a while. Let's set up a school that's relevant. We may none of us survive, but out of this may come something that happens." And something does happen. The kids get excited about relevancy and they become a persuasive force in the community, at least with their own parents, of saying, "Keep your goddamn hands off this school." And as a result something begins to move with the teachers.

We're dealing with a school that fits this as much as any one I've dealt with in my life — a high school that's driving the community wild, all except the parents and kids of that school. The parents and kids of that school are almost 99% behind it, and they're the force that's staying in. By the way, do you know where we're getting most of our teachers? Most of our teachers are coming out of our interns who came there and did their internship in this particular school. After having seen it, and spent some time there, and lived with it, they want to stay on.

It's based on a model of freedom; it's based on a model of trust. Incidentally, other teachers in the district are saying, "Won't you please get rid of that school because pretty soon I might have to behave in this kind of way and it's kind of frightening in this regard?"

So somehow or other we've got to set up a system to confuse the boards on their selections — almost organized in a way — so that some of this real kind of breakthrough comes and some kind of reinforcement comes in on it and makes it pay off.

It seems to me that the one place that we really haven't tested out is the State Department of Education. If you're going to break the system, I'd rather bet at the State Department level to move heavily on re-educating superintendents and school boards. I'd rather go to that point than to regional or a hundred big school systems.

The locus of power is in the teachers. The teachers have the absolute power to control the system. School systems can't run without teachers. They can run a school without superintendents. They can run a school system without the State Department of Education, and they can run it without school boards. But they can't run it without teachers. The real source of power that we ought to be working with are teachers, for it is in the training and the selection and the development of teachers as primary force that education will change.

POSTSCRIPT

A final word about the composition of the group meeting and the discussion of these relevant issues in teacher education is worthy of mention. The majority of the group reflected professional concerns with the preparation of teachers, both advantaged and disadvantaged. The interests of school administration, of the academic disciplines, of curriculum innovation, and of international education were reflected by a smaller number of participants. It is possible, therefore, that to some extent the conferees might have been talking to themselves as professional educators.

Although the discussion centered around the list of relevant issues, this approach served merely to stimulate as wide a range of thinking and opinion as possible. There was no effort to arrive at a single solution to any problem or question; it was assumed, rather, that a variety of alternative approaches could be taken toward any one of the issues in terms of action and implementation. Moreover, the NDEA National Institute itself during its two years of active implementations expressed in its field activities the basic idea of multiple options in the search for effective answers to important questions in teacher education.

Now, the next step is to identify the most promising leads derived from the discussions and activities, and then to put them to actual test in the field. Several uses for this report come to mind. One involves the newly reorganized Committee on Studies of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education which, through its various subcommittees, may find helpful guidelines in the formulation of structure and activities. Then, too, the academician who, after all, is responsible for approximately 85 per cent of a teacher's preparation in most college and university programs, might find this report useful; it would be profitable to get reactions from such individuals. Then there is the classroom teacher himself who could add the insights that can come only from the vantage point of the "firing line." Finally, there is the college student himself — the future teacher in training — even though his concerns have been reflected more directly through the four Student Teacher/Beginning Teachers Conferences held in various parts of the United States.*

* Project Report/Two: NDEA National Institute for Advanced Study in Teaching Disadvantaged Youth — "Teachers Education: The Young Teachers' View."